

### REMARKS

Claims 1-16 have been previously canceled and claims 19 and 29-35 are currently canceled. Claim 17 has been amended and no new claims have been added by way of this response. Thus, claims 17-18 and 20-28 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### Response to Objections:

The Examiner has objected to for the disclosure due to informalities. Applicants have amended paragraph [0014] to correct the informality and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

#### Response to Rejections Under Section 102:

Claims 17, 19-20, 22 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Lewis et al. (USPN 5,837,960), hereinafter Lewis.

Applicants' claim 17 recites in part:

... wherein the forming of at least one of the first and second regions comprises **controlling densification, porosity and surface roughness to provide different material properties in the first and second regions of the shaped object ....**

In contrast, Lewis teaches fabrication of metallic parts via directed laser fabrication (DLF) which includes controlling densification of the fabricated part as part of the DLF process. However, Lewis does not teach or suggest “...**controlling densification, porosity and surface roughness to provide different material properties in the first and second regions of the shaped object,**” as recited by claim 17.

MPEP 2131 requires “TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM.”

In view of the above, claim 17 is not anticipated by Lewis. Furthermore, claims 19-20, 22 and 25-26 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 17 as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Section 102 rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 18, 23-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that this claim is obvious over Lewis in view of Deckard (USPN 4,863,538). Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that this claim is obvious over Lewis in view of Loschau (Ceramics: Getting into the 2000's).

For at least the reasons discussed in connection with the Section 102 rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 17 as well as based on their own merits and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the Section 103 rejection.

(Please proceed to the next page.)

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 8, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood  
Janet D. Hood  
Registration No. 61,142  
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830